

FAX

TO: Mark Nowotarski

Fax: 203-973-0010

RE: 10/601118 Advisory Action

FROM: DAVID RINES

FAX: 571-273-5585

OFFICE PHONE: 571-272-5585

|   |                            |                  |
|---|----------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | Application No.            | Applicant(s)     |
|   | 10/601,118                 | ROBERTSON ET AL. |
|   | Examiner<br>R. DAVID RINES | Art Unit<br>3626 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 37-39 and 44-47.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/C Luke Gilligan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/601,118

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the amendment filed 28 February 2008, pending claims 37-39 and 44-47 would be rejected as follows: Independent claim 37 and dependent claims 38-39 and 44-47 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haner (Charles F. Haner, A Predication of Automobile Claims by Psychological Methods, The Journal of Risk and Insurance, vol. 35, no. 1 (Mar. 1968), pp. 49-59) in view of Lajunen (Timo Lajunen & Heikki Summala, Drive Experience, Personality, and Skill and Safety-Motive Dimensions in Drivers' Self-Assessments, Person Individ. Diff. Vol. 19, No. 3 (1995), pp. 307-318) and further in view of DeTore et al. (United States Patent #4,975,840). In the remarks filed 28 February 2008 Applicant substantially rehashes the remarks presented in the previous response. Accordingly, Examiner incorporates the response to the remarks presented in the previous Office Action, mailed 5 February 2008.

Applicant additionally presents new remarks directed to differences between the applied art and Applicant's claims as presently amended. In particular, Applicant indicates that the applied prior art, as per the Office Action mailed 5 February 2008, fails to teach a method wherein the personality survey questions are limited in number to 4 or more and further that the personality survey questions differ in terms of the specific content of the questions themselves. In response, Examiner concedes that the applied prior art fail to limit survey questions to 4 or more questions and further Examiner concedes that the applied prior art fails to specifically indicate that "Impulsivity" (for example) is explicitly defined as a personality metric that is a subject of the target questions. However, Examiner maintains that the specific number and content of the questions included in the survey are a matter of user choice/design choice with respect to the design of the individual surveys. Accordingly, Examiner respectfully maintains that Applicant's invention as presently claimed describes a method of survey design and administration analogous to the method described by the combined prior art and that the difference between the applied prior art and Applicant's claimed invention are limited to the questions defined by dependent claim 47. In conclusion, Examiner maintains that the method steps described by Applicant's claim 37 and the respective dependent claims as presently drafted constitute non-functional data elements as the specific questions themselves do not alter the claimed method steps.